

Mr. OLSON: On table 8, and I am not going into it too much until we come to it, but in line 2 which deals with the labour force employed you show a figure for 1966 of 144.7. I am not quite sure what that means. This figure of 144.7 is the same index equalling 100 in 1949?

Mr. BRYCE: Yes, the numbers of people employed.

Mr. OLSON: This surely does not mean there is a 44 per cent increase in the numbers receiving the same proportion of gross national product?

Mr. BRYCE: Perhaps we could leave that until we come to it. I think it is cleared later on in table 8.

Mr. OLSON: But to clear my mind for the moment does this mean that there is a 44.8 per cent increase in the labour force?

Mr. BRYCE: In the number employed in the labour force, but there has been an increase in the total population as well. There has been an increase in the numbers receiving other forms of income. Agriculture has gone down and own-account workers have gone down. There has been an increase in those receiving interest, dividends, royalties or rents as well.

Mr. OLSON: Will your explanation later include an explanation as to how many additional people are involved in receipts outlined in this item 1 with respect to their share of the gross national product?

Mr. BRYCE: I think we will come to some of that in table 8 when we come to it.

Mr. SALTSMAN: If I may pursue Mr. Olson's line of questioning a little further, I think what he is worrying about is whether there has been any change in the percentage of the population gainfully employed, as a percentage. Instead of an increase in total numbers which can be accounted for by the increase in the population itself, has there been an increase in the labour force participation in proportion?

Mr. BRYCE: There may have been an increase.

Mr. SALTSMAN: Would not this by inference mean, if we look at section 1 on table 6, that from the point of view of the family, although the allocation to the individual has remained stable in terms of wages and salaries, from the point of view of family income as a proportion it has gone down during this time? As the labour participation increases, and I presume all those participants make up a form of family unit, the total amount accruing to a family unit would be less as a percentage of the gross national product in 1965 than it was in 1949? Do you follow what I am saying, or should I try to make it clearer?

Mr. BRYCE: I think I am following what you have in mind. Perhaps I am not quick enough to see whether there is some other relationship at work here, which makes me hesitate to concur in it. The total output is going up, and of course the main thing enabling it to go up is the increasing number of workers. This is a fundamental thing in the economy. In addition, of course, we have increased productivity which we try to express in total terms in table 8. As a result they are getting increased wages. Again that will come up in table 8. Perhaps it would be better if we turned to table 8 in a moment and discuss these points there.

Mr. SALTSMAN: Instead of dealing with aggregate figures, this line deals with a percentage which seems to remain very stable. This has no bearing on the labour force, that is on the salaries of the labour force, but it has a bearing on the percentage of wages going to the labour force. The labour force as a percentage of the population has increased so that at the same time, I presume, the percentage of income going to each family would be less, because more members of a family would now be engaged in the labour force.

Mr. BRYCE: But that has increased our total output as well.